

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/990,507	Applicant(s) DOCKUS ET AL.	
	Examiner John J. Zimmerman	Art Unit 1775	

All Participants:

- (1) John J. Zimmerman.
- (2) Michael J. Stimson (Reg. No. 45,429).

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 9 February 2004

Time: 11:30 am

Type of Interview:

- ☐ Telephonic
- ☐ Video Conference
- ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

64, 69-73, 86

Prior art documents discussed:

NA

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


JOHN J. ZIMMERMAN
(Examiner) SPE, Signature EXAMINER

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner suggested proper Markush language by changing "comprising" to "consisting of" in claims 64 and 86. In addition, the use of "comprises" in claims 69-73, lines 2, was discussed since the scope of the bonding layer of independent claim 57 is "consisting of". Mr. Stimson noted that since dependent claims are limited to the scope of the language of the independent claim, the use of "comprises" in these claims could only open the composition up as much as the scope of the bonding layer composition of claim 57 and therefore did not present a conflict with the language for the independent claim.